IMPROVING THE CAPABILITY OF STRUCTURE MASTERY THROUGH CONTEXTUAL LEARNING IN THE FIRST SEMESTER STUDENTS OF ENGLISH EDUCATION AT UNIVERSITAS MUHAMMADIYAH SURAKARTA

Dra. Sumayah, MA. , Tri Wulandari

[1,2] Department of English Education Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia
✉ sum207@ums.ac.id, a320180233@student.ums.ac.id

Abstract

Contextual teaching is a contextual teaching learning, namely learning that helps lecturers in relating the material being taught to students' real-world situations and encourages students to make connection between their knowledge and its application to their daily lives. This involves seven main components of effective learning, namely; constructivism, questioning, inquiry, learning community, modeling, reflection and authentic assessment n English Education students at Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta. This research was carried out at Faculty of Teacher Training and Education, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta in approximately four months from August 2021 to November 2021. The subjects of this study were students of the first semester of Sentence Building. Research data sources are from lecturers and students. The data are texts of the assignments and tests and the results of analysis answers. Data were collected through the collection of tasks and tests, and observations, then validated using triangulation of methods and data sources. The data analysis technique uses a calculation formula. The data of the impact of the implementation are analyzed by describing and presenting. The use of contextual analysis improves students' understanding. The results obtained were as many as 20 students scored above 70 or 76.92% and 6 students achieved standard indicator scores or about 23%. This achievement had met the criteria for indicators of success (70%). as much as 1.15% and the number of students who managed to increase by 7%Keywords: Sharia Compliance, BPRS, pandemic covid-19, murabaha

Keywords: *Sentence Building, Text Comprehension, Students, English*

1. Introduction

One of the skills that must be mastered in learning English is sentences. Almost students have made sentences in English. This sentence learning has been taught since middle school and even since elementary school. The structure of each sentence varies depending on the type of sentence itself. But sometimes, many English learners are not correct in making sentences so that they are difficult to understand. This is based on many factors. These factors include learners do not understand the types of sentences and tenses in English. They have not mastered grammar.

Grammar is one of the important components in making a sentence that can be developed into a text. According to Gerot and Wignell (1994), grammar is a theory of language in which language is created and organized into a single unit. Grammar helps to understand a text. In

English, grammar has three forms that are often used in learning in schools, namely traditional grammar, formal grammar, and the most recent one is Systemic Functional Grammar (SFG).

Of the three (3) types of grammar, Traditional Grammar is the choice in learning for UMS semester 1 students in the Sentence Building course. Traditional grammar is the grammar used to describe the grammar of Standard English by comparing it to Latin. In this type, learners learn the parts of speech, namely nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions, articles, conjunctions, substitutes and exclamations.

Traditional grammar has a basic analysis of sentence structure in form and function. Form refers to a class of words such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, prepositions. In addition, form also refers to types of phrases such as noun phrases, verbs, adjectives, prepositions and so on. Object clauses, properties and descriptions are also included in form analysis. This class of words is called Content words. Function refers to the function of a word that expresses a grammatical structural relationship with other words. Words that play such a role are called function words. This function word has little or no meaning but it does not mean that this function word has no purpose.

In making sentences, most of the students are still wrong in applying the verb. They often add to be present (am. is, are) and to be past (was, were) in a sentence. They also cannot understand finite and non-finite verbs. Errors in making sentences also appear in the correspondence between the subject and the predicate.

The research target will be focused on students of the first semester of Sentence Building (1) English Language Education at the Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta. This Sentence Building course is the basis for understanding the next Structure course, namely Phrase Constructing, Clause Developing and Standardized Test of Structure. If at the beginning of learning, students have not been able to understand verbs correctly, then they will also find it difficult to understand higher levels in the field of Structure. In addition, mastering these courses well will make it easier for students to understand other courses.

Based on a brief explanation of the background of this research problem, the researcher aims to identify the level of understanding of the predicate in the sentence and describe the implementation of the Contextual method in Sentence Building students. The author gives the title of this research with "Improving the Ability to Understand Structure in Sentences Through Contextual Methods in Semester I Students at the University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta. Thus, the formulation of the problem can be drawn from this research, namely (1) Can contextual learning improve the understanding of Structure ability in English education students at Muhammadiyah University Surakarta in the first semester? (2) How is the implementation of contextual learning to understand Structure in English education students at Muhammadiyah University of Surakarta?

This research will be conducted at the Faculty of Teacher Training and Education (FKIP) Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta (UMS) which is located on Jalan A. Yani, Mendungan, Pabelan, Kartasura District, Sukoharjo Regency, Central Java. This research will be carried out for approximately six months starting from August 2021 to January 2022. The researcher chose this university because in the English language study program there is a Sentence Building course where the researcher is also the instructor of the course.

The subjects in this study were students of the first semester English Education Sentence Building grammar, FKIP, University of Muhammadiyah Surakarta, totaling 26 people. This

research is action research. The design of this research is Classroom Action Research (CAR). According to Carr & Kemmis (2009):

"Classroom Action Research is a form of self-reflection that is done by the participants (teacher, students, or head master) in social condition for correct righ/teousness: social practices or education, the meaning about practices, situations where the practices is done."

2. Method

Researchers use CAR because this research method can find the best thing that can improve sentence comprehension skills for Sentence Building students. Kemmis, McTaggart, & Nixon (2014) say that there are three CAR procedures, namely planning, implementing actions and observing, and reflecting. This CAR is carried out in two cycles, as below:

Cycle 1 includes planning, namely analyzing the curriculum of the courses, planning the implementation of lectures and preparing learning and assessment instruments.

Implementation Actions include carrying out planning, explaining learning materials, providing examples of analysis, distributing simple reading texts for analysis. Then Observation which includes making observations during lectures, noting every activity in class, monitoring student activity. The last is reflection, namely analyzing deficiencies during the planning phase, identifying findings during the implementation of actions, carrying out reflections on ongoing activities, reflecting on student learning patterns, reflecting on the results of student analysis. after cycle 1 is complete then it is repeated in the same way in cycle 2.

Data and Sources Data from lecturers are sentences in English, while data and data sources from students are the results of sentence tests using the Contextual method as well as notes and field observations.

Data collection techniques in this study by means of tests and observations. while the Data Collection Instruments in this study used the form of (a) assignments and tests given to students; (b) student observation sheet to observe the learning process of Sentence Building.

The data validation technique uses method triangulation and data source triangulation. According to Rahardjo, M. (2010), triangulation method is a data validation to obtain information through several methods used in research such as observation, interviews, and surveys. While triangulation of data sources is obtained by obtaining information through data sources in this study.

Action process data in the form of tasks and tests were analyzed descriptively by using the presentation value of increasing understanding of sentences. The calculation formula is as follows:

$$NA: \frac{Test\ score}{Maximum\ Score} \times 100\%$$

The data on the impact of the Contextual method implementation were analyzed by reducing the data, presenting the data, and drawing conclusions according to the topic and problem formulation.

Research data sourced from lecturers are in the form of English Structure questions, while data from students are in the form of worksheets and answers. Collecting data by giving tests and or

assignments and observations. The data validation technique uses triangulation of methods and data sources. In analyzing the data using the calculation formula:

NA: $\underline{\text{Test score}}$ x 100%
Maximum Score

3. Results and Discussion

The results found in this study include two findings from two cycles, namely cycle one and cycle two.

Table 3.1. : Results of Cycle 1 Assessment (Test value list Odd semester of academic year 2021 – 2022 Sentence building courses)

NO	NIM	NAME	SCORE
1	A320210001	Bulanku Maharani	33
2	A320210002	Safina RiesaMyla Shakeela	33
3	A320210004	Damar Jati Pamungkas	55
4	A320210011	Shabrina Zulfati Az-zahra	42
5	A320210016	Diah Fajar Rahmawati	30
6	A320210026	Siti Alda Ibrahim	45
7	A320210027	Fionita Valent Nanda Sabili	48
8	A320210042	Maheswari Callula	52
9	A320210044	Arifa'i Arsyad Hartono	45
10	A320210069	Rizki Rahma Putri	52
11	A320210087	Novarel Adiasta Teguh Perdana	45
12	A320210088	Nuraida Nugraheni	27
13	A320210096	Muhammad Reza Punjabi	48
14	A320210109	Nadiya Dina Salma	40
15	A320210110	Nabila Dina sahla	40
16	A320210113	Tyas Putri Aistyana	52
17	A320210201	Laili Barokatin Ahsani	55
18	A320210212	Salsabila Azzalia	24
19	A320210213	Nilam Trahkumala	52
20	A320210221	Finny Fadhilah Carolyna Abdul	45
21	A320210229	Diaz Kurniawati	70
22	A320210230	Oktavioni Laili Fauziyah	36
23	A320210234	Muhammad Adi Kurniawan	52
24	A320210238	Muhammad Fathi Azzam	42
25	A320210242	Yusuf Hafizh Zharif	61
26	A320180287	Laras Arum Pratiwi	27
		Total	1151
		Average	44,26

Description :

Excellent (100)
Very Good (99 – 90)
Good (89 – 80)
Fair (79 – 70)
Poor (69 – 60)
Very Poor (59 – 30)

Table 3.2. : Results of Cycle 2 Assessment (Test value list Odd semester of academic year 2021 – 2022 Sentence building courses)

NO	NIM	NAME	SCORE
1	A320210001	Bulanku Maharani	72
2	A320210002	Safina RiesaMyla Shakeela	76
3	A320210004	Damar Jati Pamungkas	80
4	A320210011	Shabrina Zulfati Az-zahra	80
5	A320210016	Diah Fajar Rahmawati	80
6	A320210026	Siti Alda Ibrahim	80
7	A320210027	Fionita Valent Nanda Sabili	76
8	A320210042	Maheswari Callula	88
9	A320210044	Arifa'i Arsyad Hartono	80
10	A320210069	Rizki Rahma Putri	72
11	A320210087	Novarel Adiasta Teguh Perdana	72
12	A320210088	Nuraida Nugraheni	72
13	A320210096	Muhammad Reza Punjabi	72
14	A320210109	Nadiya Dina Salma	72
15	A320210110	Nabila Dina sahla	72
16	A320210113	Tyas Putri Aistyana	88
17	A320210201	Laili Barokatin Ahsani	92
18	A320210212	Salsabila Azzalia	96
19	A320210213	Nilam Trahkumala	92
20	A320210221	Finny Fadhilah Carolyna Abdul	72
21	A320210229	Diaz Kurniawati	84
22	A320210230	Oktavioni Laili Fauziyah	80
23	A320210234	Muhammad Adi Kurniawan	88
24	A320210238	Muhammad Fathi Azzam	76
25	A320210242	Yusuf Hafizh Zharif	80
26	A320180287	Laras Arum Pratiwi	80
		Total	2072
		Average	79,69

Description :
Excellent (100)
Very Good (99 – 90)
Good (89 – 80)

Fair   (79 – 70)
Poor   (69 – 60)
Very Poor (59 – 30)

Table 3.3. : Performance Indicator

No.	Problems	Initial Conditions	Final Conditions	Description
1.	Understanding Results	44,26 %	79,69 %	Increase

4. Conclusion

At the end of the first cycle of learning activities, a written test was carried out to 26 students. Learning Outcome Test Data in Cycle I The number of students who scored more than KKM 70% was 6 students or 20.00% and the number of students who achieved standard indicators was 24 students or 80.00%. The percentage of students' understanding achievement in learning sentences is 65.26%. This achievement does not meet the criteria for success indicators (70%), so it is necessary to make improvements both in the learning process carried out by lecturers and student learning activities. Overall, the results of the implementation of the first cycle can be concluded that it has not met the success criteria in the sense that the implementation of learning activities has not been completed.

Then the researcher did a reflection. In the absence of face-to-face contact with students, the teaching and learning process cannot be perfect. Students really learn independently based on the material delivered in writing through Schoology. They don't find a solution if they don't understand a topic, on the other hand, lecturers also cannot provide complete guidance and explanations about "predicate" in a sentence clearly. Then a face-to-face learning was held which was attended by 25% of students. Students who are not present can still follow through Gmeet. In this learning, there is a question and answer session about all matters related to structure, especially the predicate problem which is the main topic in this research. In this interaction, the researcher observed the students. Students are not used to dealing with Structure problems, especially the problem of identifying predicates in a text. Then the researcher gave reading material as a representation of contextual learning. In this activity, students understand the structure, especially the predicate that has been applied in a reading. Students are taught or guided to find the predicate. The learning atmosphere becomes fun because students get the challenge of identifying the predicate in the text. After a while, the researcher gave questions through Schoology to work on. The results obtained were as many as 20 students scored above 70 or 76.92% and 6 students achieved standard indicator scores or about 23%. This achievement has met the criteria for success indicators (70%).

From the data above, contextual learning has succeeded in improving students' ability to master the structure or grammar of English.

Reference

[1] Adenan, F. (2001). *Systemic Functional Linguistics: Meaning Carriers in Functional Grammar, XIII* (3), (pp 221-232). Yogyakarta : Humaniora.

[2] Carr, W.& Kemmis, S. (2009). Educational Action Research: A Critical Approach. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

[3] Gerot, L., & Wignel, P. (1994). *Making Sense of Functional Grammar*. Australia: Gerd Stabler.

[4] Gledhill, C. (2011). A lexicogrammar approach to checking quality: Looking at one or two cases of comparative translation. In *Perspectives on translation quality* (pp. 71-98). De Gruyter Mouton.

[5] Gledhill, C. (2011). The 'lexicogrammar'approach to analysing phraseology and collocation in ESP texts. *ASp. la revue du GERAS*, (59), 5-23.

[6] Supadmi, N., Sudipa, N., Budiarsa, M., & Laksana, I. K. D. (2020). The Ideology of Narrative Text "I Lacur": The Systemic Functional Linguistic Perspective. *The International Journal of Social Sciences World (TIJOSSW)*, *2*(2), 161-168.